

THE
Anti-Slavery Reporter

PUBLISHED UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE
BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Series 4.
Vol. XXV., No. 3.

JUNE-JULY, 1905.

{ Gratis to
Subscribers.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE,
ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY	59
NATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS AT BRISTOL: ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING ...	69
SLAVE TRADING IN THE CONGO STATE	72
SLAVERY IN SOMALILAND	74
THE RIGHTS OF PEMBA SLAVES	74
SIR CHARLES ELIOT ON EAST AFRICA... ..	80
CAIRO HOME FOR FREED WOMEN REPORT	84
SLAVERY IN FRENCH WEST AFRICA	85
MOROCCO SLAVE MARKETS... ..	88
INFERIOR RACES	88

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY,

51, DENISON HOUSE, VAUXHALL BRIDGE ROAD, LONDON, S.W.

L. E. NEWNHAM & COWELL, Printers, 75, Chiswell Street, London, E.O.

1905.

The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

PATRON:

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

President:

1883 SIR THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, Bart., G.C.M.G.

Vice-President:

Treasurer:

1901 H. W. W. WILBERFORCE, Esq.

Committee.

1898 W. A. ALBRIGHT, Esq.
1876 J. G. ALEXANDER, Esq., LL.B.
1901 B. R. BALFOUR, Esq.
1888 J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, Esq.
1894 E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
1893 CEPHAS BUTLER, Esq.
1889 SYDNEY C. BUXTON, Esq., M.P.
1893 JOEL CADBURY, Esq.
1893 FREDERICK G. CASH, Esq.
1904 J. EDMUND CLARK, Esq.
1894 R. N. CUST, Esq., LL.D.
1883 R. W. FELKIN, Esq., M.D.
1885 MAJOR-GENERAL SIR F. J. GOLDSMID,
K.C.S.I.
1886 HENRY GURNEY, Esq.
1887 DANIEL HACK, Esq.

1904 SIR H. H. JOHNSTON, G.C.M.G.,
K.C.B.
1882 CALEB R. KEMP, Esq.
1895 CAPTAIN H. NEEDHAM KNOX, R.N.
1895 DONALD MACKENZIE, Esq.
1894 W. CAREY MORGAN, Esq.
1893 JOHN MORLAND, Esq.
1901 WM. C. PARKINSON, Esq., L.C.C.
1893 JOSEPH A. PEASE, Esq., M.P.
1903 H. PIKE PEASE, Esq., M.P.
1882 ARNOLD PYE-SMITH, Esq.
1885 FRANCIS RECKITT, Esq.
1885 W. H. WYLDE, Esq., C.M.G. (late
of the Foreign Office *Slave-Trade De-*
partment).

Corresponding Members:

RIGHT REV. BISHOP TUCKER, Uganda.
G. T. ABRINES, Esq., Tangier.
FRANK ALLEN, Esq., Alexandria.
THEODORE BURTT, Esq., Pemba.
HON. AND REV. H. CLARKE, Jamaica.
WILLIAM HARVEY, Esq., Leeds.
CAPTAIN E. C. HORE, Tasmania.
G. P. HUNOT, Esq., British Vice-Consul, Saffee.
MONS. HIPPOLYTE LAROCHE, Paris, Ancien
Résident Général de France, Madagascar.

M. LE PROFESSEUR G. BONET MAURY, Paris.
A. C. MORASSO, Esq., Gibraltar.
G. MOYNIER, Esq., Geneva.
SEÑOR JOAQUIM NABUCCO, Brazil.
PROF. EDOUARD NAVILLE, Geneva.
M. JOH. PATER, Tcheran.
COMTE DE ST. GEORGE, Geneva.
WILLIAM SUMMERS, Esq., Tangier.
M. LE COMTE D'URSEL, Brussels.

Secretary:

1898 TRAVERS BUXTON, M.A.

Bankers: MESSRS. BARCLAY & CO., Ltd., 1, Pall Mall East.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

JUNE—JULY, 1905.

[The Editor, whilst grateful to all correspondents who may be kind enough to furnish him with information, desires to state that he is not responsible for the views stated by them, nor for quotations which may be inserted from other journals. The object of the REPORTER is to spread information, and articles are necessarily quoted which may contain views or statements for which their authors can alone be held responsible.]

Annual Meeting of the Society.

THE Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was held on Friday afternoon, June 2nd, in the hall of Denison House. Sir T. Powell Buxton, President, occupied the Chair, and amongst those present were Sir Wm. Lee Warner, K.C.S.I., Rev. Canon C. H. Robinson (Editorial Secretary of the S.P.G.), Mr. J. A. Pease, M.P., Mr. J. Cathcart Wason, M.P., Dr. R. N. Cust, Dr. A. E. Druitt (C.M.S.), Mr. J. G. Alexander, Mr. E. W. Brooks, Mr. H. R. Fox Bourne, Mr. Henry Gurney, Mr. Caleb Kemp, Mr. Francis Reckitt, and the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN began by reminding the Meeting that the Society had only recently moved into their new premises. After many years in the City, where they had occupied a house which had practically cost them nothing in the way of rent, they had been obliged, owing to rebuilding, to remove from that address to other offices. They had felt that it was very desirable to be nearer to the Houses of Parliament and the Government Offices, and had therefore taken rooms in Denison House. He hoped they were going to have a happy and useful life in the new surroundings. The move had brought a great deal of labour upon their Secretary, and they were indebted to him for the able way in which he had filled that office, and for the valuable help he had given to the objects of the Society, during the years he had been connected with it.

On such an occasion he could not but look back over the period that had passed since the foundation of the Society in the year 1839. One thing to be observed in connection with the early years of the Society's work was that men's minds at that time were chiefly occupied with the suppression of the slave trade. The objects of the work, as stated in the first principles of the Society, were to suppress the slave trade, and to endeavour to bring that about by the abolition of slavery. When they considered the condition of affairs at the time the Society was founded, and the amount of trading in slaves which was going on in many parts of the world, they had reason to thank

God for the progress that had been made. There were many who lived in the happy belief that slavery had altogether come to an end. It must, however, be acknowledged that although to some extent their Society, together with other similar organisations, had been successful, it was not true that slavery was altogether at an end. It did prevail at the present time, sometimes under the name of slavery, and in other forms, in Mohammedan countries and elsewhere. But whatever name it took, and whatever form it might assume, they, as a Society, felt it their bounden duty to do all they could to bring it to an end. There were many other forms of cruelty towards native races, and there was more than one Society dealing with different departments of the same or similar work. He ventured to think that the lines which separated their Society from other such Societies were becoming and were likely still to become more obscure as time went on. They heard of certain cruelties in different parts of the world, it might be in Africa or in Australia, and they had to face compulsory labour and the misery which came from slave trading, but there were many other forms of cruelty which could not exactly be described as slavery. The time might soon come when it would be well for some of these Societies to come closer together, for he thought that the work as a whole suffered to some extent from the existence of so many Societies, all working on similar lines, with practically the same object in view. Good work was being done by all, but if an amalgamation could be brought about between the Anti-Slavery Society, for example, and the Aborigines Protection Society, or some of the other kindred Societies, they would be able to concentrate their efforts, and they might do a great deal more together than had been done in the past.

One part of the world which had especially claimed the attention of the Society of late years was Egypt. From the reports of Lord Cromer and from other evidence they had good reason to believe that in Egypt itself a very great advance had been made, and whereas there used to be a great deal of slave holding, the trade in slaves was now almost extinguished, and slave owning was gradually and quietly giving way to the employment of labour and the payment of wages. He would like to say publicly how grateful they were as a Society to Lord Cromer for the great efforts he had made, and for the success which had attended them.

Then again progress had been and was being made in the British possessions in East Africa. But many of them regretted that that progress had not been more rapid. They were told that great difficulty had been placed in the way of slave emancipation in the coast territory of the British East Africa Protectorate because of certain words used in 1895 by the late Sir Lloyd Mathews. But he (Sir T. F. Buxton) could not agree with the interpretation which had been put upon those words, and he did not believe that they were intended at the time to cover the maintenance of slavery. It was greatly to be hoped that both now and in the future the responsible officials

would take a saner view, and would not be permitted to maintain any form of slavery on account of what was then said.

They were glad to welcome Sir William Lee-Warner and others who had rendered conspicuous service in furthering the cause they had at heart. Sir Fowell Buxton, in concluding, moved that the report which had been circulated be adopted, and also that the Committee whose names appeared on the report, together with the Treasurer (Mr. H. W. W. Wilberforce) and the Secretary (Mr. Travers Buxton), be re-appointed for the ensuing year.

Sir WILLIAM LEE-WARNER, K.C.S.I., in seconding the motion, said: I think it is very important to bear in mind that the slave trade in its worst aspects is not wholly killed, but still flourishes in some localities. The efforts which you have so successfully made in the past have only increased the horrors of that residue of the trade which still exists. It was my painful duty for many years up to about 15 years ago to read the reports of the capture of slave ships in the Persian Gulf, and in the Indian Ocean, and I say that you can imagine nothing more terrible, more sickening than the details to be found in those reports. It stands to reason that in proportion as you make it difficult for slavery to exist, and for these slave raiders to capture slaves, you increase the severity of the treatment meted out to the slaves who are captured. It is impossible to exaggerate the horrors to be found in these reports. You read of women and children who have been captured by these slave raiders being left to die on the road on their way to the slave ship, and even those who are taken on board are cruelly driven and treated on the march. Perhaps after the ship has sailed a British cruiser or gunboat is seen in the offing and then the slaves are battened down in the hold, where they have to remain until the ship has eluded her pursuers and is out of harm's way. But whilst I wish you to bear in mind that in making this trade difficult you are increasing the torture of the slaves, I would urge the Committee of your Society to persevere with their work until they have killed the trade altogether. In the second place I think we ought to bear in mind that in endeavouring to put down slavery in Zanzibar for instance, and in Mohammedan countries, we are going against the law of the Moslems and the religious feelings and customs of the people. You are introducing a great revolution, and you must be content with the assurance that there will henceforth be no more slavery. You must not be too anxious to transform the state of things, but must proceed carefully and cautiously, and not be impatient if the progress made is not quite as rapid as you could desire.

Perhaps I may give you one instance out of many to show you conclusively that this trade still goes on. I think you will all agree that it is necessary that facts should be put before the public, and that the more light we can let in upon the subject the better it will be for the cause which we all have at

heart. In February, 1902, a Portuguese cruiser, the "San Rafael," was cruising along the coasts a little to the south of Mozambique, when she sighted what was supposed to be a slave ship. She pursued her and a fight took place, and in the end the ship was captured and the 700 slaves found upon her liberated, at least 200 Arabs being killed in the fight that took place before the capture. Of course, an inquiry was demanded and was held, the officers of the cruiser justifying their action, explaining the circumstances of the capture and giving exact details as to what happened. Does anyone in this room suppose for a moment that, if in 1902 a cruiser happened to capture one slave ship, there are not many other vessels more lucky than that particular ship, which are still carrying on this nefarious traffic? To my mind this is conclusive proof that slavery is still carried on to a large extent in different parts of the world. My first argument, then, is that slavery in its blackest form still goes on, and, therefore, it is the duty of this Society and other societies working on similar lines, to continue its work and to devise the best remedies for putting an end to this state of things. You can only do that by following up such a capture and finding out where the slaves were going, and exposing the secrets and facts of the trade.

And then in the second place we have to recognise that there is a spirit abroad at the present time which belittles this agitation for the abolition of slavery. There are a number of people who maintain that slavery no longer exists, and that there is no need for this Society and other kindred organisations. The other day a gentleman said to me, "I see your name in connection with the Anti-Slavery Society; I thought you were a man who did not agree with any cant and humbug." I replied, "I trust that I am, but I shall continue my subscription to the Anti-Slavery Society because I believe there is still work for it to do in endeavouring to put an end to the slave trade." We had a talk, and I asked him what his views were. "Oh," he said, "its work is past and done with. What is the good of keeping it up? Everyone is agreed now that the matter has been settled and that slavery is at an end, and therefore there is no need to agitate any longer for its abolition." A little while after that I gave an address on the moral progress of India during the last century, in which I maintained that the abolition of slavery was, to my mind, one of the greatest of all the gifts we had given to India. Afterwards a most distinguished and eminent statesman and writer said to me, "Why, I never heard of it. I have read a good many Blue Books on India, and I always understood there was only a little domestic slavery in India, and that even under that system the natives were perhaps better off than they would be under other circumstances. I knew there were a few slaves kept as servants in the native States, but I never thought that slavery had existed to the extent to which you referred in your address." A friend of mine who overheard this remark at once told me the following story in which he was himself concerned. "A Governor-General sent a rifle as a present to a native

Rajah in the northern hills of India. I was the officer sent to present the gift, and when I gave it to the Rajah the chief proposed to go out and try it. I agreed, and we went out into the jungle. Presently the Rajah said, 'You have first shot, Colonel; there you are, there's your chance.' I saw something move through the wood among the leaves, got my rifle ready, and was just going to fire when I saw a man pass. 'Thank goodness,' I said, 'I did not shoot.' 'Why didn't you fire?' said the Rajah. I said I had seen a man running past. 'Of course,' said the Rajah, 'he was one of my slaves; why didn't you fire? Never mind, there will be another one along directly.' I believe that story to be literally true. In the olden time a chief would shoot his own servants just as he would kill a wild boar. But the point I want to emphasise is that we must be on our guard against the tendency to belittle slavery, which is, I am sorry to say, becoming rather common to-day. You know that when a country is visited by the plague or an outbreak of cholera, afterwards the bacillus lies dormant, and in a little while perhaps bears a multitude of diseases. The spirit which bears slavery and forced labour is perhaps not so active as formerly. It still lies dormant, but we must not allow this bacillus of slavery to take a more virulent form, and show signs of active growth, or if it does, immediate measures must be taken to check that growth. There is one more difficulty. We are told that after all we must not now interfere. Great Britain has got many sons and has given them independence and self-government, and therefore the mother country must not interfere with any laws they may make, or any customs they may introduce. That is all very well, and it means a very great and increasing difficulty, calling for all the influence which this Society can exert. We have got to make the good influence of this and other societies work on public opinion here at home and on our Parliament, and we have also to make its influence felt on distant Parliaments, distant Governments, and distant public bodies. That is a practical need, and therefore I think it is highly necessary that this Society should continue its labours, first because slavery in its worst form still exists in various parts, and secondly, because the spirit which has given rise to forced labour and then slavery is a spirit which lies dormant, a bacillus which exists in human nature and needs watching. Let us thank God that we have got imperial responsibilities, but let us do here, at the centre of the empire, all that lies in our power, reasonably and without professing that we have not ourselves sinned in such matters, to influence the public transactions of all these self-governing bodies, so that they may be kept true to the principles of freedom which we have inherited.

The Rev. Canon ROBINSON, in supporting the resolution, said that he had long been in sympathy with the work of the Anti-Slavery Society. He could speak from actual knowledge and experience of the existence of slavery. It was his privilege some ten years ago to take a long walk through Central

Africa, which occupied about two years. During that time he walked through a large portion of territory that was now called Nigeria, and certainly then slavery was very far indeed from being dormant. The bacillus of slavery showed signs of most active growth. The Hausa-speaking population of that country was estimated at 15 millions, and it was his impression when travelling through the country that one out of every three was a slave, making a total of five million Hausa-speaking slaves; or, if they put it another way, it would result as follows:--The population of the world was usually put at 1,500,000,000, and one out of every 300 people living in the world was a Hausa-speaking slave. During his walk of over one thousand miles hardly a day passed without his seeing very active signs of the existence of slavery, and the system of slave raiding was carried on to a large extent. On one occasion he nearly fell himself into the clutches of one of the most notorious of the slave raiders. He and his party managed to escape during the night, and set out to walk the next stage of the journey, a distance of 60 miles, only to find that the man had destroyed every particle of food, and that in all the villages they passed through he had either killed or carried off the people as slaves, so that they did not meet a solitary human being during the whole of the 60 miles' march and were very nearly starved. That was a forcible illustration to him of the existence of slavery ten years ago; no one who had not seen the district could fully appreciate the horrors of slavery in that country at that time. There was no reasonable feeling of security, and night attacks were very common. When an attack was made on a village or small town everyone who resisted would be immediately killed. The old women and young children who were, of course, of no use to the slave raiders, were killed and the rest carried away to be slaves; whole families were in this way separated, never to meet again. There could be no doubt that the slave trade was an unmitigated evil, and it was the duty of every Power that possessed sufficient force to put an end to slavery. He was glad to know that the conditions in Central Africa were not now so bad as when he visited the country. During the last ten years a most striking improvement had taken place, and that improvement was in a great measure due to the efforts of Sir George Goldie, the British Commissioner in Nigeria, the benefits of whose work for the Empire it was impossible to over estimate. It was owing to the arrangements made by him that Great Britain possessed Northern Nigeria to-day. During the Boer War the whole of the northern part of Nigeria was annexed by Great Britain, and probably some twenty or thirty million new subjects were added to our Empire. From the first Sir George Goldie was fully alive to the necessity for limiting slave raiding. It was very difficult work at first because the raiders were so strong, but step by step improvements took place; Sir G. Goldie absolutely prohibited the practice in the upper part of Nigeria, and did everything possible to stop the nefarious trade. It was at his instance that the British Government drew up a charter and proclaimed the country a Protectorate. During the last

four years great progress had been made. One after another the slave raiders were attacked by English officers in command of Hausa soldiers (for the whole of the fighting was done now by native troops), and at the present time there was not a slave raider left who had not been warned. The British Government officials had recognised the importance of interfering as little as possible with the native customs and traditions, and the native kings had been left to rule their particular districts without hindrance so long as they did not establish slave markets. When he (Canon Robinson) went through the country ten years ago every little town had its slave market. The principal one was, of course, at Kano, sometimes called the Manchester of Central Africa, which was a very old city with an enormous population and an immense market. The people were highly cultured and civilised; they had made their own cloth from a time antecedent to the Norman Conquest of England. In that city of Kano he had seen 500 slaves being sold in the open market. The whole trading of the country was done through the medium of slaves, as there was practically no coinage. The current coins of the country were cowrie shells, and inasmuch as 2,000 cowrie shells represented one shilling English money they would recognise that it was very difficult to carry money about. If they started on a long journey and tried to carry money with them, they would find at the end of a march of 300 miles that they owed all the money they brought with them to the carriers for portage, and a good deal more. The explanation was that the real money of the country was represented by slaves. Over and over again he had been offered slaves in payment for various things, but of course he had refused to take them. In recent years attempts had been made to try and create a coinage, and to a certain extent they had been successful, and in the future would be much more so. But they must not suppose that it was possible or desirable suddenly to abolish slavery. The people had kept domestic slaves for centuries, and whilst a great deal could be said for abolishing the status of slavery they must not in the case of domestic slavery expect too rapid results, or be impatient if the progress was not so quick as they wished. The Hausa people were an ancient race, with a history that went back to the distant past, and a force of character altogether superior to other native races, and if they could be kept free, and given an opportunity for doing their ordinary business in safety, they might develop in a marvellous way in the near future. Central Africa was one of the most promising mission fields at the present time. The Hausa people were not easy to Christianise, but he (Canon Robinson) thought that there was much more hope of eventually spreading Christianity throughout Central Africa by the agency of the Hausas than in any other way.

The resolution was then put to the meeting by the Chairman, and carried unanimously.

Mr. J. CATHCART WASON, M.P., then moved the following resolution:—

"This meeting renews its emphatic protest against the continued importation of Chinese indentured labourers into the Transvaal under the Ordinance of 1904, and affirms its conviction of the ever-growing need for keeping the public sentiment of the country aroused against slavery in all its forms, and the tendency of European peoples to exploit the labour of so-called inferior races in various parts of Africa and elsewhere, in disregard of humanitarian considerations, and of the natives' own interests."

He said they all knew that individual sin was a very serious thing, but national sin was infinitely worse, and they could safely say that a country which introduced or encouraged slavery was committing a national sin. This question of Chinese labour in the Transvaal was bringing and would continue to bring degradation and contempt on our Empire. Only the previous night he was talking with an old friend of his (the speaker's) from New Zealand, who had been out to the Transvaal to see if it would offer a permanent future for his sons and daughters. He had come back utterly disgusted with the country. The Chinamen seemed to be everywhere. There were some people who went so far as to say that the country would in time be again in the hands of the Boers, and that English-speaking people would be satisfied that it should be so, as they felt that the government of the country would be far better than it was under the present condition of things. Chinese forced labour was one of the worst forms of slavery, and they could not but condemn the Government responsible for the introduction of a system by which thousands of Chinamen had been taken out to the Transvaal to work in the mines to all intents and purposes as slaves. This action had degraded the name of the British Empire and had degraded the name of His Majesty the King, who had been led by his responsible Ministers to put his signature to that infamous document.

Mr. J. A. PEASE, M.P., in seconding the resolution, said that as long as he had been identified with public work, and during the twelve years he had had the privilege of serving on the Committee of that Society, he had seen the spectre of slavery again and again cropping up in different places. Unfortunately he had seen slavery established in the Transvaal under the sanction of the British Government, and a system introduced which a large number amongst the population of this country not only deplored, but felt bound to resist and put a stop to. In the few minutes at his disposal that afternoon he wished to refer to a pamphlet on Chinese labour in the Rand mines written by Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., the miners' representative in the House of Commons, and one of the most humble and retiring men he had ever come across. Mr. Burt went out to South Africa a few months ago to study the question, and had had interviews with various representative people there, and had given his conclusions in regard to the existing state of things in that most interesting pamphlet. He showed that neither the mine-

owners nor the natives nor the white population in the Transvaal were completely satisfied with the importation of Chinese labour under conditions which they deplored. When the Chinese Labour Ordinance was under discussion in the House of Commons it was said that Chinese coolies were to be introduced because of the scarcity of Kaffir labour, and yet they found from the statistics that from January, 1903, after the war, until March, 1904, there was a steady increase in the employment of Kaffir labour, the number employed rising from 48,000 to 79,000, and that during the very time that the Ordinance was being discussed by the British House of Commons. The plea, therefore, that native labour could not be obtained was a false one. The same was the case in regard to the white population. Mr. Burt in his book said there were at the present time large numbers of industrious and willing whites anxious to work but unable to obtain employment, and that it was in Johannesburg itself that he saw the greatest number of unemployed men, men eager for work, so that no recruiting sergeant need go in search of them. Mr. Burt said that the conditions under which the Chinese lived and worked were entirely inconsistent with the dignity, freedom, and independence of labour as understood by the British working man and the British people. The Chinese labour compounds bore a striking resemblance to convict settlements. "The sentinels stationed at every gateway, the three years' exile from country, home, wife and family suggest the penal settlement rather than free life and free labour." Mr. Burt had an interview with an English-speaking Chinaman, who said that scarcely any Chinamen were aware that they had to work underground, or knew of the conditions to be imposed, or the small amount of pay they were to receive. Mr. Burt also had interviews with some of the miners, and he said in his book that of all he conversed with only one approved of the bringing over of the Chinese coolies. He also found among working men of all trades "general unabated hostility" to the Ordinance. Mr. Pease, in concluding, said he believed the time had come when the country should protest further against the introduction of Chinese into the Transvaal. He believed their presence was creating a new difficulty in South Africa. It was, in his opinion, morally wrong to send Chinese to the Rand, and he was glad the Society was opposing the continuance of the system.

The Chairman put the resolution to the meeting, and it was carried unanimously.

Before leaving the meeting in order to return to the House of Commons, Mr. WASON, M.P., said that he fully appreciated all the Chairman had said in regard to the amalgamation of different societies connected with Africa working on the same lines, and cordially endorsed his views. He felt sure that such a union of forces engaged in similar work would tend to the consolidation and extension of their efforts.

Dr. A. E. DRUITT moved a vote of thanks to Sir T. F. Buxton for presiding over the meeting. Referring to the present state of things in Hausaland, where he was a missionary, he said that the years which had passed since Canon Robinson travelled in that country had witnessed a great improvement. Slaves were no longer exposed for sale in the large market places—all that had been abolished. He thought they might walk through Nigeria without meeting a slave. That was a cause for much thankfulness. But no doubt a secret kind of slavery still went on in that country, and although the legal status of slavery had been abolished in Northern Nigeria, domestic slavery had not been interfered with. He was thankful on the whole that that had been so, for if all the slaves had been liberated in a wholesale manner there would have been such a revolution as to throw the whole country into difficulties. As it was, there were slaves working more or less voluntarily in the houses of Mohammedans and Hausas, and treated with comparative kindness, who remained with their masters rather than obtain their freedom and have to earn their living in some other way. There were, of course, other reasons why they remained, and no doubt many stayed on through ignorance. A great many slaves in that country did not know of the abolition of the slave trade, and that a slave might under certain conditions become free; others again remained because of the intimidation of their masters. As to the feeling of the Mohammedans themselves in regard to the abolition of slavery, Dr. Drutt thought that at first they resented it very much and in some cases were still smarting under it, but they were beginning to resign themselves to the will of God. The speaker then referred to conversations held with Mohammedans and Hausa people on the question of slavery, and said that whilst at first they were inclined to argue against it, they came before long to see the benefits of freedom. After instancing the various methods by which slaves were intimidated into remaining with their masters, he said it was impossible to exaggerate the benefits which the abolition of slavery had conferred upon that country. Great progress had been made, and they were looking for further encouraging results in the future.

Mr. B. R. BALFOUR seconded the resolution, which was put to the meeting and adopted.

The President briefly acknowledged the vote, and the proceedings terminated.



National Peace Congress at Bristol.

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.

THE second National Peace Congress was held at Bristol on June 28 and 29, under the presidency of the Bishop of Hereford, and the Anti-Slavery Society, having been invited to send delegates, was represented at the Congress by Mr. B. R. Balfour and the Secretary. Among other subjects discussed at the Congress a resolution on the claims of the native races in the British Empire was moved in an admirable speech by Mr. J. G. Alexander, who dealt not only with the general question but with specific instances of the wrong treatment of native races in the Transvaal, in Western Australia and in the Congo State. Mr. Alexander quoted the statements of the Rev. Arnold Foster, and Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., in support of the description of the Chinese labour scheme as "the introduction of virtual slavery into the Transvaal," and the resolution was briefly seconded by Mr. H. R. Fox Bourne, who, however, suggested the excision of the clauses relating to the Transvaal, etc., as being scarcely relevant to the business of a Peace Congress. This appeared to be in accord with the general feeling of the meeting, and as time pressed, the resolution in a shortened form, commending "to all lovers of justice and peace the claims of native races in the Empire to humane and even-handed treatment," was passed without further speeches.

By the kindness of several members of the local Friends' Anti-Slavery Committee, including Mr. R. A. Milner, one of the honorary secretaries of the Congress, arrangements were made for an anti-slavery meeting to be held on the morning of June 30 after the formal sessions of the Congress, and notices of this were sent round with the other cards to the delegates. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Buxton also had more than one opportunity afforded them of meeting other delegates and of being introduced to persons locally interested in the anti-slavery cause. In spite of adverse weather a good audience assembled for the meeting, which was held in one of the rooms of the Y.M.C. Association, on whose premises most of the meetings of the Congress had taken place. Considerable interest was excited in the subject, and the result of the resolution moved by Miss Impey, that a branch of the Anti-Slavery Society should be formed in Bristol and neighbourhood, may be considered as very encouraging.

The account of the proceedings which follows is mainly taken from the report in the *Western Daily Press* of July 1 which appeared under the heading "Twentieth Century Slavery."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. K. Brown) remarked that they met at a time when they felt somewhat depressed, owing to the moral backwater they

seemed to have got into. They were small in numbers, but desperately in earnest.

Apologies for absence having been read from Mr. Joseph Storrs Fry and the Rev. Canon Tetley,

Mr. TRAVERS BUXTON, who then gave an address on the subject, said that nine people out of ten were under the impression slavery was a dead question; that it was a thing that belonged to the last century; and having come to that conclusion they troubled no more about the matter. That this was far from being the case Mr. Buxton proceeded to show by reference to what went on on the East and West Coasts of Africa. The 1903 report of the Zanzibar Maritime Bureau stated that the work of Arab slavers would not cease in East Africa as long as there existed a market where slaves fetched a good price. In 1902 there was a sea fight in which a Portuguese cruiser was engaged, and as a result 700 slaves were taken and liberated, 200 Arabs being killed in the fight. A Portuguese naval official reported that the trade was carried on not only by small men but by big syndicates, influentially backed, and slaves found a ready sale at Muscat. The ship's papers were all in order, the slaves were hidden, and treated as bales of merchandise, and the provisions of the Brussels General Act did not allow such a search to be made in these cases as would enable the traffic to be stopped. The report stated that if there were power to remove the hatches and search the vessel thoroughly much might be done. Lord Cromer (whose work in suppressing slavery in Egypt Mr. Buxton heartily recognised) had reported on the slave dealing that was not even yet stamped out in the Soudan in spite of the vigorous measures which had been taken to put it down by the Slavery Department. On the West Coast of Africa there were in Angola numbers of contract labourers who were practically slaves. The Anti-Slavery Society had been in communication with the Portuguese authorities and the British Foreign Office about the matter; their allegations were at first denied by the Portuguese, but there was now a promise of inquiry. Slaves were still brought from Central Africa to the coast and exported for the plantations, and a trade in slaves also went on on the borders of Angola and the Congo State just where these countries touched British territory. In Morocco slavery was the ordinary state of things. In Tripoli the agents of the Italian Anti-Slavery Society reported on the trade in slaves which went on from the ports to Turkey. Mr. Buxton then combatted the arguments of those who said a mild form of domestic slavery was the best thing for the African natives, and he also dealt with the strong tendency now manifested to let slavery in under other names. They heard of inducements to labour and teaching natives the dignity of work. When they got to that sort of argument they were on a slippery slope, for they must remember that if the native worked on his own land for himself it did not count. There was too much of the exploitation of native races for financial

interests, and there was consequently great need for arousing a sound public opinion on this subject. The Anti-Slavery Society had felt it its duty to oppose very strongly Chinese labour in South Africa. (Applause.) Legal opinion showed that the Ordinance of 1904 was contrary to the fundamental principles of the common law of England. Mr. Buxton concluded by moving—

“That this meeting recognises the need for maintaining an active opposition to slavery and the slave trade wherever they still exist, and protests against the oppressive exploitation of native races and slavery in every form.”

Mr. B. R. BALFOUR seconded the resolution and referred to some of the historical associations of the Anti-Slavery Society and the desirability of forming local branches to make known the facts and extend the interest. He hoped that the result of that meeting would be the reviving of a branch in Bristol. Mr. Balfour also dealt with the present financial position of the Society and the need, which was becoming an urgent one, of obtaining a wider support. The Society and its work were too little known.

Mr. J. G. ALEXANDER, as the senior member of the Committee, recalled some of the names of those who had done good and great work for the Society in past years—William Allen, Edmund Sturge, Horace Waller, Charles Allen—and rejoiced that well-known anti-slavery names were still represented among the Society's officers. He alluded to the feeling, which had lately become stronger among those interested, that the Aborigines Protection Society, whose work was so close to their own, should draw still nearer to the Anti-Slavery Society, with whom they now often worked in common. There had been an understanding that the Aborigines Protection Society should especially deal with South African questions, which of late had been clamant, but their aims were the same.

The Rev. M. J. ELLIOTT remarked that everyone, practically, believed in the anti-slavery movement, but there was much need of a widened interest in the anti-slavery organisation.

Mr. H. R. FOX BOURNE, Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Society, expressed the hope that before long the two organisations would find a means of combining their forces. Having spoken of the slave trade carried on in the southern part of the Congo State, with the tolerance of that State, and the connivance of Portuguese officials, Mr. Fox Bourne said he had been in communication with Lord Lansdowne on the subject, and had from his lordship a promise of inquiry into the allegations.

The resolution was carried.

Miss IMPEY (Street), in moving that a branch of the Anti-Slavery Society be formed for Bristol and neighbourhood, directed the thoughts of those present to the negro question of the United States. She said the

caste question in America, a remnant of slavery, still remained to be dealt with, and there was no organised society defending the negro cause at all. The determination was to keep the blacks at the foot of the ladder. There was a distorted feeling of prejudice against people who had been in the past oppressed. (A Voice: "It will work itself out in time.") That was a fallacy. Some Southern States were revising their constitutions and cutting away their right to vote. Things were getting worse and worse. It was this intense prejudice that made lynchings possible.

The fairest man who had negro blood might be punished in a penitentiary—and a clergyman punished also, for performing the ceremony—if he married a woman with no negro blood. Any amount of irregular intercourse was not objected to, but directly there was a legal tie then came the severity of the law. Lynching was one of the things that both man and woman were liable to; they were liable to be burned to death for such a crime in America.

Miss SIMPSON (a young coloured lady from Washington) said that in nearly all the coloured States refined and cultured coloured people could only travel by being herded with cattle and drunken ruffians. In many the vote had been taken from them. It was possible for a man to be lynched quite close to the capital for marrying a coloured woman, even on a suspicion of having done so, and a few years ago, within fifteen miles of the capital, a man was so lynched. It was impossible for English people to believe these things in face of the United States' boast of being the land of the free. One of the best of the colleges connected with the Society of Friends, and she believed a second also, was closed against coloured people, and she suggested that members of the Society of Friends in England might usefully use their influence to get that changed.

Some other addresses were given, and it was urged that more should be said of these subjects in places of worship. The resolution was carried with an understanding that there should be a conference with a standing committee of the Friends' Society in this district so as to obviate the existence of two organisations.

Slave Trading in the Congo State.

SOME extracts from letters written by a missionary, to whose reports on the same subject we alluded last autumn, have been forwarded to us, relating to the slave trading which goes on in the region South of the Congo State, and on the borders of Angola. It will be remembered that the Anti-Slavery Society addressed a letter at the end of last year to the Foreign Office, urging the great need for further British consular representation in that part of West Central Africa, in view of the trading carried on by Portuguese in

natives raided from the interior, who are destined for the islands of San Thomé and Príncipe, where an extensive system of contracted labour prevails.

The Aborigines Protection Society, as well as our own Society, has been assured that the abuses have not been lost sight of by our Foreign Office, but it will be seen that the writer reports the slave trade and traffic in arms in the Congo State to be "increasingly brisk."

The frequent boast of the Congo authorities that they have suppressed the slave trade seems, then, to be worth as little as their professed concern for the moral regeneration of the natives.

December 8th, 1904.

" . . . As to the slave trade in the Congo State. Four of our men have just returned from a journey west, through the Congo State to Kavungu, our mission in Lovaleland, and they report :—

"Revolted soldiers returned to their stronghold on the Lukoleshe River, from whence they were reported to have been driven by Lieut. Baillons, aided by Mukandu Bantu (or Maldi II.) and his native warriors, three and a half months ago. They are still devastating, enslaving and supplying Bihean and Portuguese traders with slaves.

"Our men met two very large slave caravans, with one of which was a Portuguese trader. The one was met at Olohosi, and the other at Bumba's—the latter not marked on the map, but five days' journey north-east from Kavungu, our mission station. The former, Olohosi, is one day west from the Lukoleshe River. . . . They were selling guns and gunpowder, *ad lib.*, and buying gangs of slaves. These slaves are destined for the Bihe and Benguela markets, their ultimate destination being Príncipe and San Thomé islands. . . . I send you a cutting from the diary of our pioneer colleague, who is now back in Africa, and you can see from my underlined passage that the slave trade still thrives in San Thomé. [N.B.—In this passage he writes of San Thomé:—"Thousands of Africans are brought here to labour in the plantations. 'This is the slave island,' whisper some of the passengers. Alas, it is only too true; here the 'old time' slavery is still practised."] I have myself seen scores of slave gangs en route to the coast. At the coast, *i.e.*, Benguela or Katumbella, they are bought by local traders; prices ranging from 20 milreis to 75 or 100 milreis. They are then forced to put a cross to a contract, the terms of which they are ignorant of, and then each has a tin ticket put round his neck, receives a loin cloth, shirt, cap and blanket, and all are shipped on board the steamers of the *Empresa Nacional* in gangs (all this I have seen) and thence deported in care of an agent to the islands referred to, *i.e.*, to their respective masters there. I have also been ashore at both those islands, visited the plantations, seen the slaves at work, and spoken to them in their own tongue."

February 12th, 1905.

" . . . Two of my men have just come back from a journey west in the State, and report the revolted soldiers as active as ever, and the slave trade and firearms and powder traffic with the State increasingly brisk. Why the State will not endeavour to suppress the slave trade and stop the wholesale annual influx of Portuguese Angola slavers, I do not for the life of me pretend to know. . . .

Slavery in Somaliland.

THE question of slavery in Italian Somaliland is occupying the serious attention of the Italian Government. An official report just published in Rome states that along the coast real slavery has disappeared, leaving in its place only the mildest form of domestic servitude. In the interior, however, matters are very different. Still, though the facts are admitted to be serious, the report points out that they have their roots so deeply planted in the economic conditions that to attempt suppression by decree would only aggravate the evil. The Government is urged to adopt the slower but more sure process of gradually undermining the existing bad economic conditions by others more favourable to liberty.—*Globe*, June 19th.



The Rights of Pemba Slaves.

THE case of Mshangama, the Pemba slave, who, on receiving his freedom, was deprived of his small property on the ground that he was in debt for rent to his former master, has been several times referred to in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. We are now able to publish the letters which have passed between the Friends' Anti-Slavery Committee and the Foreign Office respecting this judgment. It should be stated in explanation of the first letter that the missionaries belonging to the Friends' Industrial Mission felt convinced by their knowledge of the parties and of the circumstances of the trial that the claim for rent had not been made by the plaintiff (the master) in the first instance, and that rent was not even mentioned when the slave applied for his freedom and lost his land.

This Lord Lansdowne, in a letter to Mr. Armitage in September last, declared to be entirely incorrect, and based his assertion on the text of Mr. Farler's judgment, and "more especially by his notes made at the hearing," of which a copy was enclosed.

But it was admitted by Judge Skinner-Turner, who subsequently re-heard the case on appeal, that Mr. Farler's judgment was, in the first instance, given "shortly and verbally" early in January, and that he did not write a judgment, giving reasons, until later.

"There is no doubt in my mind," said Judge Skinner-Turner in his judgment, "that the idea in both the master's and the slave's minds was, and is, that the pieces of land in question were taken away because Mshangama was a slave."

Lord Lansdowne laid great stress on Mr. Farler's notes, which were said to have been "taken at the hearing" on January 9th, but as these very notes refer to evidence which was admittedly not taken until January 22nd, it seems clear that there was a mistake somewhere, and that this matter of dates was important.

The letter addressed to Lord Lansdowne by the Friends' Committee, and endorsed by a letter from the Anti-Slavery Society, at the end of last year, was as follows:—

DUVALS, GRAYS, ESSEX,
December 21st, 1904.

To The Right Honourable

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE, K.G., etc.

MY LORD,

The Committee of the Friends' Industrial Mission, Pemba, desire to lay before your Lordship the following comments on your reply, dated September 14th, to the letter of Mr. Herbert Armitage, one of our missionaries, dated July 26th last, with regard to the case, *Mgwachani Goto v. Mshangama*.

1. Your Lordship has evidently read the notes of Mr. Farler's judgment in this case as having been written on the date when he first heard it, January 9th, 1904. We submit that they cannot have been written before January 22nd, when he re-heard the case in the absence of the defendant. We rely chiefly for this conclusion on the judgment delivered by Judge Skinner-Turner on the re-hearing of the case, and this conclusion is confirmed by notes received by us from Mr. H. W. Sellars, another of our missionaries, of the evidence given on the re-hearing. A copy of these notes will be found in an Appendix to this letter.

2. It will be observed that Mr. Farler's notes are headed "January 8th, 1904," although all the documents elsewhere give January 9th as the date of the first hearing. This incorrect date is explained by an incident recorded in Mr. Sellars' notes. From these it appears that Mr. Gardner, another of our missionaries, who was, with Mr. Sellars, permitted by Judge Skinner-Turner to assist Mshangama at the re-hearing, stated: "It seems to us" (that is, to the two missionaries) "impossible to believe otherwise than that the evidence" (that is, as to the alleged debt) "was taken after the judgment was given." To this Judge Skinner-Turner replied: "No, no, no; that could never be," and proceeded to explain that the discrepancy was due to the fact that Mr. Farler had re-tried the case on January 22nd, but that it was really tried and judgment given at the first hearing on the 8th or 9th, *he did not know which as it was just put in at the bottom of the page*. This seems to suggest that the notes were subsequently written in on a blank space of the Court-book between the 8th and 9th.

This suggestion is borne out by the fact that the evidence of Mtendeji bin Shale is entered in full, next to that of the plaintiff, in Mr. Farler's notes, although in fact no evidence other than that of the parties themselves was taken until January 22nd. This is distinctly stated as regards Mtendeji by

Judge Skinner-Turner, in his judgment on the re-hearing, where he explains that Mr. Farler, "in the same month of January, sent again for the master and for a man called Mtendeji to satisfy himself that he was right. This inquiry led him to confirm his previous decision and he then wrote a judgment giving his reasons in detail for awarding the piece of land to his master. At this second inquiry the ex-slave, Mshangama, was not present."

It is thus clear, we submit, that the notes were entered by Mr. Farler in the Court-book on or subsequently to January 22nd, and were not "notes made at the hearing" on January 9th, as your Lordship had been led to suppose.

3. It further appears from the notes of the evidence at the re-hearing made by Mr. Sellars, who has been in the island four years, and is thoroughly acquainted with the language and habits of the people, that the following points were clearly brought out.

(a) That at the first hearing on January 9th nothing was said as to any rent being due by Mshangama. This was stated both by Mshangama himself on May 16th, and by his former master, Mgwachani, on the 18th. Judge Skinner-Turner, it appears, was unwilling to believe the latter's statement, on what ground does not appear; yet the statement was strongly against Mgwachani's own interest.

(b) That Mshangama was not present and had no opportunity of answering the fresh evidence brought against him on January 22nd. This is acknowledged by Judge Skinner-Turner, who seeks to justify it as an inquiry made by Mr. Farler to satisfy his own mind. This explanation, however, is evidently inconsistent with the way in which the evidence of Mtendeji is entered in Mr. Farler's notes as leading up to his judgment.

(c) That Mr. Farler, at the first hearing, stated that a slave could not hold land.

4. As regards point (a) we cannot understand how Judge Skinner-Turner arrived at his conclusions, and we submit that the question calls for further investigation.

5. As regards point (b) we have only to call your Lordship's attention to what appears to us a serious irregularity.

6. As regards point (c) Judge Skinner-Turner recognised that Mr. Farler had conveyed to both the master and his freed slave the impression that "the pieces of land in question were taken away because Mshangama was a slave." We are glad that his judgment has finally and decisively disposed of this idea. We fear, however, that the publication of the judgment in the *Zanzibar Gazette*, in the English language, is not sufficient to remove the impression created in the minds of the people of Pemba by this and other cases that every slave who applies for emancipation runs the risk of losing any little property he may have acquired. This idea must discourage the best class of slaves, those who have shown thrift and foresight, from applying for freedom, and it probably accounts in part for the greatly diminished number of applications for emancipation during the last year or two. We would urge the desirability of issuing an explicit official statement, in Swahili, to remove this impression.

7. For similar reasons, we regret that Judge Skinner-Turner should have sanctioned a mode of procedure which he recognises to be irregular, namely, that on a slave coming forward to apply for freedom his former master has been allowed to set up a money claim against him in respect of an agreement alleged to have been entered into by the slave, and under this plea to take away the little property acquired by his own thrift. We submit that such claims, if they are to be allowed at all, ought to be made quite independently, and a proper interval allowed before execution is granted on the freed slave's property. We cannot regard these provisions of the English law as mere formalities, but as safeguards which are peculiarly needed in the case of ignorant men just emerging from a condition of slavery.

8. Yet more fundamental, however, is the following objection to the decision in this case. Judge Skinner-Turner, in his judgment of May 28th, 1904, says that a slave's property remains his on gaining his freedom, but "it must remain subject to the ordinary incidents of the law of debt." But we venture to point out that the debt alleged to have been owing by Mshangama to his master was not an ordinary debt incurred between man and man, but was one for "back-rent" to which the master laid claim on the ground that Mshangama, when his slave, had occupied a portion of his land for seven years. The relation of Mgwachani Goto to Mshangama was not that of landlord to tenant but of master to slave, and the rent payable by Mshangama was rent *in lieu of service*. We venture to point this out as there appears to have been some misunderstanding of the circumstances in the minds of both judges. Judge Skinner-Turner in the course of his judgment said, "The question of slavery does not enter into the matter, I treat it as if Mshangama were a free man;" and Mr. Farler in his judgment says, "Free labourers hold land from their master in consideration of working for them, i.e., a labour rent of eighteen hours a week, or a cash rent R1 a month." But Mshangama not being at the time a free labourer, any argument based on this custom is not, we submit, relevant.

No formal contract had been made between Mgwachani Goto and Mshangama, but the relation between them was one of slavery in accordance with which Mshangama owed his master personal service; the consideration for such agreement as existed between them was, on the part of Mshangama, a rendering of service which appears since the Decree of 1897 to have been in some cases commuted by masters into a money payment by the slave.

We therefore respectfully submit that the relation between Mgwachani Goto and Mshangama before the latter was freed this year is not one which the Law can recognise nor in any arrangement which existed between them, on which the demand is based, such as the Law can enforce, for by Article 2 of the Sultan's Decree of 1897 it is provided that, after the date of that Decree, "the District Court shall decline to enforce any alleged rights over the body, service, or property of any person on the ground that such person is a Slave."

9. We cannot conclude without once more pressing upon your Lordship the great desirability of speedily putting an end to the present complicated and unsatisfactory system, in the interest of both planters and slaves, as well as in the higher interests of morality. It was certainly not intended by those who suggested the abolition of the status of slavery, as a means of bringing that

institution to an end, that it should be used as a means of prolonging its existence and putting obstacles in the way of freedom. They hoped that the measure adopted by the Mohammedan State of Tunis in 1846, by the East India Company throughout the territories ruled by them in 1843, by the British Government in the Gold Coast and Nigeria, and by the French Government in Madagascar, might be applied to the British Protectorate of Zanzibar, without real loss to the masters, and without stirring up dangerous excitement amongst the enfranchised population. We appeal once more to His Majesty's Government to put an end without further delay to the disgrace inflicted on our country by the continuance of slavery under the protection of the British flag.

On behalf of the Friends' Anti-Slavery Committee,

(Signed) E. WRIGHT BROOKS.

The reply to this letter was delayed until reports on the case had been received from the officials on the spot.

REPLY FROM THE FOREIGN OFFICE.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 13, 1905.

SIR,

With reference to the letter from this Office of December 31st, respecting the case of the freed slave Mshangama, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to inform you that the Reports asked for from Judge Skinner-Turner and Mr. Farler, on the criticisms of their action in connection with this case contained in your letter of December 21st, have now been received.

The greater portion of your letter dealt with the decisions which Mr. Farler and Judge Skinner-Turner had given in their capacity of Judicial Officers: and it need scarcely be pointed out to you that neither Lord Lansdowne, nor any other member of the Executive Government of the country can exercise any control over the decisions given by the judges in the discharge of their official duties, and that the latter could not properly be asked to furnish reports in explanation of such decisions.

As, however, certain passages in your letter appeared to bring charges of a personal nature against the conduct of these two officers, his Lordship considered it only fair to give them an opportunity of replying.

With regard to paragraphs 1 and 2 of your letter above referred to, it appears that the allegation that Mr. Farler's notes entered in his note-book under January 8th, were written, not on the date of the first hearing (January 9th), but on or after January 22nd, is entirely devoid of foundation. They were entered on January 9th.

With regard to the statement in paragraph 3, that Mshangama was not present at the rehearing of the case on January 22nd, it appears that he was not summoned, because it was not in reality a rehearing, but only a further inquiry made by Mr. Farler to satisfy himself that there had been no miscarriage of justice. After hearing that the Friends' Mission had declared that Mshangama had suffered an injustice, he determined to go into the case again. He therefore summoned Mtendeji, a near neighbour of Nguochano. Mtendeji gave him a clear statement from his own knowledge which fully confirmed the evidence of Nguochano, and Mr. Farler therefore decided that there was no need to rehear the case.

Lord Lansdowne has satisfied himself that there is not the slightest reason to believe that either Mr. Farler or Judge Skinner-Turner have ever stated or supposed that "a slave cannot hold land," or that their judgments were based on any such ideas; or that the Slavery Decree is not thoroughly understood by Mr. Farler, and applied by him in the spirit in which it was enacted. On the other hand it must be remembered that the Sheria, which was the law of the land until the promulgation of the Slavery Decree, lays down that a slave can have no property, and it is not surprising that an ignorant Mpemba should think that the Sirkar gave him this land under the Sheria, which had prevailed in the country for centuries. There can be no doubt that it will take some time to eradicate this idea from the Wapemba, who are extremely ignorant and shy, and hardly any of whom can read.

Lord Lansdowne has further satisfied himself as to the untrustworthy nature of the statements made by Mshangama on which your criticism of the action of these gentlemen would appear to be in greater part based, and he can only regret that Mr. Armitage should not have taken more pains to make sure of the accuracy of his facts before bringing charges against them tending to show their unfitness for the posts they occupy.

I am to add that a careful review of all the circumstances connected with this case, has confirmed his Lordship in the view that the manner in which Mr. Farler exercises his difficult duties reflects on him the greatest credit.

In conclusion, I am to express his Lordship's hope that in view of the exhaustive inquiries that have been made in Mshangama's case this correspondence may now cease.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

To E. W. Brooks, Esq.

F. A. VILLIERS.

On this official letter little comment need be made, for it is in no sense a "reply" to the statements made in Mr. Brooks' letter, which were not made rashly, but are believed to have been accurate in every detail.

The "allegation" that Mr. Farler's notes, which refer to an event admitted to have taken place on January 22nd, were not written until that date, or after it, is met by a flat contradiction! It is, of course, not the business of the Anti-Slavery Society to take up the particulars of this case, but on the general question of the official recognition of slavery implied in the judgment, which is set forth in paragraph 8 of Mr. Brooks' letter, we feel strongly, and on this serious point involving the interpretation of the Anti-Slavery Decree of 1897, Lord Lansdowne is silent, except for the bare assertion that there is no reason to believe that "the Decree is not thoroughly understood by Mr. Farler, and applied by him in the spirit in which it was enacted." From this statement we must respectfully dissent, but the personal question is now one of merely academic interest, as it has been recently announced that Mr. J. P. Farler, whose administration the Foreign Secretary thinks so creditable, has ceased to be Commissioner of Slavery for Pemba.

The correspondence is now closed, and the Friends' Committee are not disposed to reopen it, believing that the letters speak for themselves, and hoping that while in this individual case an undoubted injustice has been done, good will result from bringing the affair into the open daylight, and that in the future the property of slaves will be respected.



Sir Charles Eliot on East Africa.

IN his recent work on the British East Africa Protectorate* Sir Charles Eliot, who was until last year H.M. Commissioner, has produced a book of unusual value and interest. The features of the country and the character and history of its peoples are described by a close observer with skill and insight, while the political and other problems of the country are stated in a manner free alike from party bias and from undue official reserve. The difficulties which led to the author's resignation are only alluded to in the preface. Sir C. Eliot's style is frank and lucid, as readers of his official reports will remember, and the book is full of wise judgments and thoughtful suggestions, and contains not a few good stories.

We are especially interested in the chapter on Slavery, which has played so prominent a part in the history of the African races. This is doubtless due in great part, as the author suggests, to the weakness of all negro social organisations and to the thriftless nature of the Africans. In any case the burden of suffering which they have borne from this cause is, Sir Charles Eliot says, far greater than has fallen to the lot of other uncivilised people. Though, as a rule, neither physically weak nor cruel, the African has for centuries been made the victim of the slave trade by men of stronger races.

The horrors and cruelty of this trade, the author reminds us, whether on the East or West coast, can hardly be exaggerated. Its suppression has proved far more difficult on the east, and "the trade long survived formal prohibitions, which had no real effect." Repeated treaties have been made by Great Britain with the rulers of Zanzibar for its suppression, but "it is only with the advent of this century that it can be said to have really ceased."

Even this statement, we may add, is too general, when we recall such a sentence as that which occurs in the Report of the International Maritime Bureau for 1902, that

"The attempts of Arab slavers to recruit slaves in East Africa will not come to an end so long as there exists markets in the districts about the Persian Gulf where slaves fetch a good price."

* *The East Africa Protectorate* : Edward Arnold.

SLAVERY IN EAST AFRICA.

On the vexed question of the retention of slavery in the ten-mile strip, Sir Charles Eliot has the following remarks:—

"The position of our East African possessions with regard to slavery is somewhat peculiar. They are founded on the suppression of slavery; our interest and activity in this part of the world largely originated in our desire to put down the slave trade: the establishment of our rule, by effectively terminating that trade, has been one of the greatest philanthropic achievements of the later nineteenth century; and yet, by a strange combination of circumstances, the East Africa Protectorate is severely, and not altogether unjustly, criticised for maintaining and tolerating slavery at the present day."

Sir C. Eliot then goes on to allude to the famous assurance as to "ancient customs" given by Sir Lloyd Mathews in 1895, when Great Britain took over the Coast, and to the present legal recognition of slavery in the ten-mile strip, and admits that the situation is "regrettable."

"Great Britain has always adopted an anti-slavery policy, and inconsistencies and anomalies in a policy which professes to be based on motives of morality and not on expediency, cannot be allowed without a certain loss of sincerity and moral prestige. They are peculiarly inconvenient when they can be explained by interested motives. In this case, slaves are allowed to claim their manumission as a right in Zanzibar, and the Zanzibar Government, in whose finances the British Government is not directly interested, are obliged to compensate the master for the loss of his slave. In the East Africa Protectorate, in whose finances the British Treasury is directly interested, freedom cannot be claimed as a right, and the British Government will not compensate masters.

"The contrast is certainly unfortunate, and illustrates what foreigners call our hypocrisy. . . . In the present case I am bound to say that I think that this unfortunate contrast between Zanzibar and the Protectorate is not due as a matter of fact and history to a disinclination to spend money, but rather to the conflict between our principles and our promises. Both are equally sacred, and we must remember that, though there would be no excuse for anyone who should promise to tolerate Arab customs, including slavery, nowadays, things were very different at the time when the promises were made. Before the Mazrui rebellion in 1895, the Arabs were really an independent power under our protection, but by no means amenable to our orders in internal matters. We could not have suppressed domestic slavery, and it might have been dangerous to interfere with it. But still it is unfortunate that we undertook to tolerate it."

Sir C. Eliot does not think the harm done by the continuance is great, as no slaves can now either be born or acquired.

The late Commissioner does not mention the fact that according to the important judicial decision of April, 1898, all slaves imported into the Coast territories since the decree of 1876 were "illegally held and should be con-

fiscated," which means that a very large proportion of the slave population of the Coast strip are legally free. Unfortunately the Administration have not taken advantage of this decision to do away with the humiliating anomaly which Sir C. Eliot sees so clearly.

In the light of what is often said in these days about the advantages of domestic slavery, the following opinion is of weight:—

DOMESTIC SLAVERY.

"I am not one of those who think that domestic slavery is a harmless institution, or so interwoven with the habits and customs of the country that it cannot be dispensed with. Even if we admit that the improvident negro races are best off when they are under an obligation to work, there is no reason why individuals should be bound to particular masters; and the system by which a man who works outside his master's estate has to pay him a portion of his earnings must be condemned. Also it cannot be denied that the Arab character is prone to deliberate cruelty and is not to be trusted with irresponsible authority over persons of inferior race."

Sir Charles Eliot, however, questions whether it is "worth while to take energetic measures" to sweep away so shadowy a system as slavery has now become in the Coast-strip.

As regards the position in East Africa outside of the Coast-strip, Sir Charles alludes to his official assurance in 1903, that slavery was non-existent, and the criticism thereon that if there were, as he stated, parts of the territory as yet unexplored, and tribes as yet unknown, there was insufficient warrant for so general an assurance. To this objection, which struck him as worthy of attention, the author replies that he still thinks both his statements are justifiable. It is true that next to nothing is known of certain tribes, but just as cannibalism always becomes known and those who practise it excite dread, if not exactly moral detestation, so tribes which raid for slaves are at once known, dreaded, and avoided.

Sir Charles does not think any tribes in East Africa have this reputation, the only slave raids in recent years having been made by Abyssinians.

The *Anti-Slavery Reporter* was among those who made the criticism referred to, and Bishop Tucker of Uganda was of opinion that the Commissioner's assurance was too confident. We are glad, however, to know that Sir C. Eliot holds that there was justification for his general statement, even though we may think that, being an inference, it is a decidedly optimistic one.

The late Commissioner closes his remarks on slavery with the following striking paragraph:—

"I would fain see the stain of slavery removed from the Coast; but, with this one exception, I think we have every reason to congratulate ourselves, without undue self-laudation, on the accomplishment in East Africa of one of the greatest works of humanity which the world has seen. It is only ten or fifteen

years since the whole country, from the Ocean to the Congo, groaned beneath oppression and bloodshed. On the coast the Arabs took two children out of three of every family as slaves. From Lake Victoria almost to Mombasa the Masai harried the whole land. The valleys were deserted, and no one dared to keep cattle for fear of exciting the cupidity of the raiders. In Uganda, Mtesa and Mwanga put to death tens of thousands in apparently aimless fury, to say nothing of tortures and mutilations. The caravans of slave traders traversed the whole country seeking for their victims. . . . If East Africa is not yet a paradise, we may at least congratulate ourselves on having changed this scene of human suffering. The slave trade is at an end, and even sporadic cases of kidnapping are not heard of any more. . . . Africa has not yet become civilised, but it has become possible to think of civilisation."

We are glad to find that Sir C. Eliot considers it desirable to terminate the arrangement by which the Coast-strip is held under lease from the Sultan, as it is "of no advantage to anybody," and is only a great inconvenience and cause of possible complications. The whole system of the Sultan's mainland dominions is now a mere theory and legal fiction, which, it is to be hoped, may soon be brought to an end.

This is not the place to refer to the suggestions which Sir Charles Eliot makes in regard to administration, and among the many subjects which he handles, we have space to allude to one or two only, and that very briefly.

THE UGANDA RAILWAY.

This railway, Sir C. Eliot tells us in his interesting chapter, "has literally created a country." It was built, at great cost, on "happy-go-lucky methods," but the result is successful and useful.

"I think even hostile critics will admit that it justifies its existence. The slave trade has disappeared so entirely that one is apt to forget that only a few years ago it was a real horror and scandal which called for energetic suppression. . . . The completion of this route has had the most remarkable effects in opening up the countries of Central Equatorial Africa, and dissipating the cloud of ignorance by which they were concealed."

THE ARABS.

The Arab character, in Sir C. Eliot's opinion, does not leave a favourable impression on the observer. Their intelligence is great, but an element of cruelty and sensuality is rarely absent. Unlike the Turks, who combine a genius for conquest with incapacity for government, the Arabs, while "intensely aristocratic and domineering," seem wanting in the qualities of military races. Their minds

"seem sterile in art, trade, government, or organised warfare, perhaps owing to an incapacity for self-discipline and the nemesis which makes the slave-owner incapable of being master of himself. For it must be confessed that it is as slave-owners and slave-traders only that the Arabs have cut a figure in East Africa."

The Arabs have not the instinct of cultivators or men of business. As long as the Zanzibar plantations could be cultivated by "a wholly disproportionate and unnecessarily large number of slaves" they were fairly prosperous. But they dislike paying wages, and allow their estates to fall out of cultivation rather than adapt themselves to new conditions.

PUNITIVE EXPEDITIONS.

Sir C. Eliot writes strongly against a policy of militarism and specially against punitive expeditions.

Unfortunately the military and civil ideals are somewhat different, but Sir Charles proposes that the military forces should be reduced and the police force increased. Every administration ought to regard a punitive expedition as an evil and in some ways an admission of failure, and the late Commissioner believes that in the future there ought to be hardly any such expeditions in East Africa.

"The contest with the powers of nature seems a nobler and more profitable struggle than the international quarrels which waste the brain and blood of Europe and Asia. A time must come when militarism will be felt to be intolerable, and it will be recognised that the fighting and self-sacrificing instincts find a better expression in feats of endurance and exploration than in obeying the dictates of national animosities."



Cairo Home for Freed Women.

THE usual report of this institution for the past year shows that there continue to be very few slave women to take advantage of its benefits (although the number is slightly in excess of those who passed through the Home in 1903), but, in the opinion of Lord Cromer, the work is still needed.

The following official letter has been received from Lord Cromer, together with the yearly statement of accounts:—

SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 9th instant, I have the honour to enclose herewith a statement of the accounts of the "Home for Freed Women Slaves" in Cairo for the year 1904.

I am informed that the number of slaves who passed through the Home in 1904 were:—

2 white,
1 Abyssinian,
6 Soudanese.

A child of 6 years old was found in Abbassieh, and was sent to the late Zakie Pacha's Harem, where she is reported to be well and happy.

Three of the black girls have been placed in situations, the others went to join their friends.

In spite of the small number of slaves who passed through the Home during 1904, I am of opinion that that establishment is doing good work, and that it should be continued.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) CROMER.

TRAVERS BUXTON, Esq.,

British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

HOME FOR FREED WOMEN SLAVES.

— 1904. —

EXPENDITURE.	£ E. Mill.	RECEIPTS.	£ E. Mill.
Matron's Salary ...	58.500	Balance:	
Rent	48.748	With Matron 1st Jan., 1904	1.405
Household Expenses ...	82.145	With Bank 1st Jan., 1904 ...	214.920
	189.393	From Egyptian Government ...	300.000
Purchase of £200 Egypt. Unified	209.333	Dividend on £780 Water Co. ...	30.710
		1 Drawn Bond Cairo Water Co.	19.450
		Dividend on Egyptian Unified	
		£200	7.700
		Donation £20 at 97½	19.425
Balance in Bank 31st December,		Received as fee200
1904	197.624	Due to Matron	2.540
	<u>£596.350</u>		<u>£596.350</u>

Examined and found correct.

Slavery in French West Africa.

AN article in a French newspaper, *Le Courrier Européen*, calls attention to the following case of the legal recognition of slavery in Senegal, where, as in all other French colonies, it is supposed to be non-existent since the Act of Abolition in 1848.

It would appear to be one of those cases which are only too liable to happen in the African possessions of all countries, where advantage has been taken of a legal technicality to obstruct the equitable carrying out of a great principle of justice. Of all old customs, none is harder to kill than slave trading and slavery in Africa. We have a recent illustration of this in the

facts which were brought to light last year in the Italian Colony of Benadir. But we may look nearer home and find in our own East African Protectorate that slavery in the Coast Strip is not abolished because of the "pledge" alleged to have been given in 1895 to maintain old customs and respect the Moslem religion.

The case described in the following paragraphs certainly calls for an amendment in the law, and we hope that the question will be taken up in the French Parliament.

In an article which was published in a French magazine in 1903, extracts from which we gave in these pages, it was stated there was a penalty in Senegal for all slave trading and a fine of 100 francs for every captive. The law appears, however, to have been evaded by the subtle distinction below set forth.

"A cultivator in Senegal possessed a female captive whom he had not purchased himself, but who had been purchased by his mother twenty-five years before. This captive when compelled to leave her master left him her three children. Two of them were freed, but the third, named Dara Fall, aged eight years, was sold for an ox valued at 250 francs and 50 francs in cash. The purchaser resold the boy for a horse valued at 350 francs and 50 francs in cash. These things did not happen a hundred years ago, the successive bargains having taken place in 1903 and 1904.

"The Court of Cassation decided that in the present state of our law such a transaction was allowable. How could this be? Let us try to follow the argument, which is a little complicated.

"The decree of 1848 abolished slavery; it forbade all Frenchmen to possess, to buy, or to sell slaves, and to participate directly or indirectly in any traffic or exploitation of this kind, but this was a simple prohibition, which should be distinguished from the negro *slave trade*, a crime which did not come within the purview of the decree of 1848. This is an extremely subtle distinction which was assuredly not foreseen by Schoelcher when in his report of 1848 he expressed regret at being obliged to ask for two months' delay in order to prepare the necessary measures for the application of the abolition decree, and when he said :—

"The decree does not wait any longer to free the negro for ever from that which constituted the very character and misery of his state: *sale*, and personal chastisement. In purifying our colonies from the slavery which defiles them, the decree provides further against its ever polluting them again; it extends to their territory the virtues of French soil, mere contact with which gives liberty.'

"In fact at the same time that the first article of the decree decided that slavery was to be entirely abolished in the colonies two months after its promulgation in each of them, it added that without any delay all *sale* of persons not free and all corporal chastisement were absolutely prohibited.

"It seems that this decree should not be considered as having suppressed the slave trade, and jurists observe that the members of the provisional government forgot to say that their decree abolished all previous laws relating to the negro slave trade.

"Hence the legal position is quite clear. France may boast of having been one of the first nations to suppress slavery, but if a Frenchman takes a fancy to engage in negro-dealing, the courts, in judging his case, will only take account of the laws which were promulgated when slavery still existed and when the sale and merchandise of human beings was only forbidden under certain conditions.

"The law of March 4, 1831, which is still in force, only punishes those who shall have bought or sold negroes brought into the colony by the slave trade. The legislator, in his kindness to these traders, even added that if this circumstance of their introduction by the slave trade had been forgotten by the trader, he was not to be uneasy. Finally no action could be taken after the expiration of a year from the time that the black had been introduced.

"As a matter of fact the young Dara Fall has not been brought into the colony by a trader, but was born in it, his mother having been a slave there before him. Consequently the citizens of Senegal can sell and resell him with impunity.

"Such is the system of our Court of Appeal in West Africa, which has received the sanction of the Court of Cassation. I question its accuracy even from the legal point of view. Why did the judges speak of the 'captive' Dara Fall? If the sale or purchase of negroes is still permitted, it seems that Dara Fall is truly a slave. Justice ought logically to have given him this name, and then what becomes of the decree of the Government of 1848?

"Pending steps being taken by Parliament to extricate us from this position, I call upon the French Government to give Dara Fall his freedom. His present owner bought him for a horse and fifty francs. Our Finance Minister will perhaps find the funds to redeem him."



Morocco Slave Markets.

THE following paragraph appeared in the *Sketch* recently :—

"A friend who is in Fez watching the development of negotiations between the Sultan of Morocco and M. St. René de Taillandier, the French Envoy, writes that, out of respect to the feelings of his distinguished visitors, the Sultan has ordered the Sok el Abeed, or Slave Market, to be closed while the Mission is in the city. This concession is a very artful one, and may well serve a double purpose. It shows, in the first instance, a very delicate regard for European prejudice; it also gives the more fanatical Moors to understand what they must expect in the days when the will of Europe is imposed upon the last independent kingdom of the once dark Continent. The sale of slaves is a very remarkable ceremony. When the buyers have taken their seats in the marketplace, the auctioneers advance in line to the centre of the market and offer up a prayer. They appeal for divine favour on behalf of buyers and sellers and anathematise Satan and all his works. The buyers interpolate 'Amen' at the proper moments. And when the last word of prayer has been said, the slaves are brought forward, parcelled out among the auctioneers, and led round the circle of the buyers, who raise the prices of the men, women, and children they desire to purchase."

Inferior Races.

"SUPPOSE now there is such a thing as an all-round inferior race. Is that any reason why we should propose to preserve it for ever in a condition of tutelage? Whether there is a race so inferior I do not know, but certainly there is no race so superior as to be trusted with human charges. The true answer to Aristotle's plea for slavery, that there are 'natural slaves,' lies in the fact that there are no 'natural masters.' Power is no more to be committed to men without discipline and restriction than alcohol. The true objection to slavery is not that it is unjust to the inferior, but that it corrupts the superior. . . .

"Is there, however, an all-round inferior race in the world? Even the Australian black-fellow is, perhaps, not quite so entirely eligible for extinction as a good, wholesome, horse-racing, sheep-farming Australian white may think."—From *A Modern Utopia*, by H. G. Wells.